UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defender filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, V. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet respond. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defendently	1
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD Plaintiff, V. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet respond. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 20: the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	2
DISTRICT OF NEVADA UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 201 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	3
DISTRICT OF NEVADA UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #1013). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	4
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, V. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	5
ORDER ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet respond. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defendently filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge.	6
Plaintiff, V. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	7
V. GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defendate filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	8
GUARD DOG HEAVEN, LLC, Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	9
Defendant. ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	10
ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judged.	
ORDER Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2014 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
Presently before the court is plaintiff Union Pacific Railroad Company's second renew motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded. The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #106). Defendant Guard Dog Heaven has not yet responded The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2019 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defendance of filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judged.	
The dispositive motion deadline in this case was originally set for April 30, 2012. On the date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2021 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
date, plaintiff filed a motion seeking an extension of the deadline. (Doc. #102). On May 8, 2021 the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defended filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
the magistrate judge entered an order granting the extension. (Doc. #103). Subsequently, defendation of filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
filed an objection to the order and motion, arguing that the deadline should not have been extended (Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	18
(Doc. #104). On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	19
On May 25, 2012, the undersigned referred defendant's objection to the magistrate judge	
determine if, in light of defendant's objection, the order extending the motion deadline should	
vacated. (Doc. #105). The objection is still pending.	
25	
26	
27	
James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge	James C. Mahan

Rather than wait for the magistrate judge to issue a final ruling on whether an extension of the motion deadline is appropriate, plaintiff filed the present motion. The court will deny the motion without prejudice, pending a ruling by the magistrate judge on the underlying objection filed by defendant. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED June 5, 2012. James C. Mahan

- 2 -

U.S. District Judge

Case 2:09-cv-01622-JCM-RJJ Document 108 Filed 06/05/12 Page 2 of 2